

or suggest each and every claimed element. See also *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 19 recites instructions for directing a processing unit to store an identification of one of said plurality of subsystems in a record for said configuration data for said object identifying said one of said plurality of subsystems as requiring notification of changes to said configuration data of said object. Carcerano does not teach storing the identification of a subsystem requiring notification of changes to a record for the configuration data.

Instead, Carcerano teaches a system that allows a user to view and update a configuration of a device on a network. See Abstract. The system receives a request for the configuration data over the network from a requesting station. See step s810 of FIG. 8b and Col. 14, lines 38-46. In response to the request, the configuration data is read from the database, a response that includes a display of the information is generated, and the response is transmitted to a requesting station. See step s811, col. 14, lines 47-59. To update configuration data of a device, a second URL -encoded request is received from the requesting station. See steps 812, col. 14 lines 60- 67. The request includes the new configuration data. Id. The database is then updated in response to the request. Id.

There is no mention in the Carcerano reference of storing an identity of a requesting subsystem in a **record** in the database to identify the subsystem is to be notified when the configuration data is changed. The Examiner states:

Carcerano further discloses the http server 103 receives the URL-encoded requests from browser 83 and process those requests. The URL in the request identifies one of the CGI scripts 106. http server 103 executes the CGI script, as discussed above, so as to generate a response to the URL-encoded request (Col. 10, lines 12-18).

This statement does not teach or indicate storing an identification of said one of said plurality of subsystem in a record for said configuration data. At best, the cited passage implies that a request that includes the identity of a requesting workstation (i.e. network address) is stored in a memory so that the request may be read and a response sent to the identity stored in the memory. This memory would be a part of RAM or some other volatile memory buffer active in communications. This is not similar to and in no way suggests storing the identity in the record of the configuration data. Any person skilled

in the art with a reasonable understanding of the operation of computer systems would not assume that storing an identity in RAM or any other volatile memory is or implies the same function as storing an identity in a record in a maintained database. Therefore, this rejection must be removed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that claim 19 be allowed.

Claims 20-26 are dependent from claim 19 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20-26 be removed and claims 20-26 be allowed.

Claim 27 recites the method for performing the process described by the instructions in claim 19. Therefore, claim 27 is allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 19. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of amended claim 27 be removed and claim 27 be allowed.

Claims 28-34 are dependent upon claim 27. Thus claims 28-34 are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 27. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that claims 28-34 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.

Dated: April 07, 2003



William P. Wilbar
Reg. No.: 43,265

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500